DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 640 RC 012 233

AUTHOR	Fife, Gary
TITLE	Indian Education: An Examination of Issues. The Ford Fellows in Educational Journalism Report.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	10 Jan 79
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*American Indian Education: American Indians: Community Control: Cultural Awareness: *Educational History: Educational Legislation: Elementary Secondary Education: *Federal Indian Relationship: *Relevance (Education): *School Community Relationship: Self Determination: Tribes: *Urban American Indians
IDENTIFIERS	Bureau of Indian Affairs: Dakota (Tribe): Heart of the Earth Survival School MN: Highline Indian Tutoring Program WA: Ojibwe (Tribe): *Tribally Controlled Education: Winnebago (Tribe)

ABSTRACT

State and federal laws and policies affecting Indian education, four Indian education projects, and comments from two Indian leaders are included in this review of current Indian educational issues. Laws affecting Indian education are briefly traced from a 1794 treaty to the Indian Education Act of 1972. Bureau of Indian Affairs policies are assessed as are state policies in regard to the use of federal monies for Indian education. One of the four Indian education projects is the Heart of the Earth Survival School in Minneapolis which is described as an urban Indian effort to maintain cultural heritage and solve urban Indian problems. An Indian curriculum project in a Minneapolis elementary school is described which emphasizes contemporary Dakota, Ojibwe, and Winnebago people. Seattle's Highline Indian tutoring program is detailed as is the Seattle Indian Heritage High School which is an effort by local Indian parents to gain control of their children's education, yet still remain within the public school system. After a review of more recent congressional activity on Indian education, there is a section with comments by Forrest Gerard, a Blackfoot Indian who is Assistant United States Secretary for Indian Affairs, and by Dr. Gerald Gipp, a Sioux Indian who is Director of the Office of Indian Education. (AN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191640

The Ford Fellows In Educational Journalism Report:

INDIAN EDUCATION: AN EXAMINATION OF ISSUES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary D. Fife

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By Gary Fife
Reporter
United Indian Planners News

RC 01 2233

Ford Fellows in Educational Journalism
is a program of The George Washington University's
Institute for Educational Leadership.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) seeks to strengthen present and potential leadership in American education at the policy level of state and federal government. Established in 1971, IEL is a policy planning and coordinating agency for a number of related educational programs, including Education Policy Fellowship Program (EPFP), Educational Staff Seminar (ESS), The Associates Program (TAP), a radio series over National Public Radio titled, "Options in Education," Family Impact Seminar (FIS), Washington Policy Seminar (WPS), Ford Fellows in Educational Journalism (FFEJ), and Education of the Handicapped Policy Project (EHPP).

A program of The George Washington University, IEL is supported by a grant from The Ford Foundation and by other foundation and federal grants and contracts.

1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036 **Telephone: (202) 676-5900**

INSTITUTE ADVISORY BOARD

CHAIRPERSON—DR. BERNICE SANDLER
Director, Project on the Status and Education of Women
Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE CARLOS CHARDON
Secretary of Education
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

K. Z. CHAVIS
President
Arlin, Inc., Red Oak, N.C.

DR. JOHN DAVIS
President
Macalester College, St. Paul

DR. JOHN DUNWORTH
President
George Peabody College, Nashville

DR. LLOYD ELLIOTT
President
The George Washington University

DR. MICHAEL FAY
Executive Director
Institute for Teacher Leadership
United Teachers-Los Angeles

HONORABLE GARY K. HART
Assemblyman, General Assembly, State of California

FRANCIS KEPPEL
Director
Aspen Institute Education Program

HONORABLE HOWARD KLEBANOFF
Chairman, Board of Higher Education
State of Connecticut

RUTH MANCUSO
Chairperson
New Jersey State Board of Education

RUBY G. MARTIN
General Counsel, Committee on the District of Columbia
U.S. House of Representatives

HONORABLE LUCILLE MAURER
Delegate, General Assembly, State of Maryland

DR. LOUIS W. MAYO
Vice President for Policy Studies and Special Projects
The George Washington University

HARRY McPHERSON, JR.
Attorney, Washington, D.C.

DR. RICHARD PESQUEIRA
President
University of Southern Colorado

JOHN PITTENGER
former Secretary of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

LOIS RICE
Vice President
College Entrance Examination Board

DR. ALAN ROSENTHAL
Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University

DR. PAUL B. SALMON
Executive Director
American Association of School Administrators

DR. RICHARD SNYDER
Mershon Professor of Education and Public Policy
Ohio State University

DANIEL B. TAYLOR
State Superintendent of Schools
State of West Virginia

DR. CHARLES WATTS
former President
Bucknell University

DR. PAUL N. YLVISAKER
Dean, Harvard University

INSTITUTE STAFF
SAMUEL HALPERIN—Director
ELIZABETH JOHNS—Associate Director for Management
DIANE BRUNDAGE—Communications Coordinator
DIETRA NORRIS—Chief Administrative Officer
CATHERINE ARNOLD—Budget Officer

EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
PAUL SCHINDLER—Director
ELIZABETH HALE—Associate Director
JEROME CONTEE—Assistant Director

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
EMERSON ELLIOTT—Acting Director
HARRIET BERNSTEIN—Assistant Director

THE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM
PHILIP KEARNEY—Coordinator and IEL Associate Director for State Programs

"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION" OVER NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO
JOHN MERROW—Producer

FAMILY IMPACT SEMINAR
A. SIDNEY JOHNSON, III—Director
THEODORA OOMS—Deputy Director
RUTH HUBBELL—Associate Director for Research

WASHINGTON POLICY SEMINAR
GEORGE KAPLAN—Coordinator

FORD FELLOWS IN EDUCATIONAL JOURNALISM
DIANE BRUNDAGE—Coordinator

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED POLICY PROJECT
LISA WALKER—Coordinator

INDIAN EDUCATION:
AN EXAMINATION OF ISSUES

By Gary Fife
Reporter
United Indian Planners News

and

Ford Foundation Fellow
in Educational Journalism,
1978

January 10, 1979

Index

		Page
I.	Where We Are	1
II.	The Schools	9
	A. Heart of the Earth	9
	B. Hans Christian Anderson	15
	C. Highline Indian Tutoring Program	17
	D. Indian Heritage High School	23
III.	New Laws	26
IV.	View From The Top	32

I

Where We Are

We know that you highly esteem the kind of learning taught in those colleges. But you, who are wise, must know that different nations have different conceptions of things; and you will therefore not take it amiss if our ideas of this kind of education happen not to be the same with yours.

We have had some experience of it. Several of our young people were formerly brought up at the colleges of the northern provinces; they were instructed in all your sciences; but when they came back to us they were bad runners, ignorant of every means of living in the woods, unable to bear either cold or hunger, knew neither how to build a cabin, take a deer nor kill an enemy, spoke our language imperfectly; were neither fit for hunters, warriors or counselors; they were totally good for nothing.

We are, however, not the less obliged by your kind offer, though we decline accepting it; and to show our grateful sense of it, if the gentlemen of Virginia will send us a dozen of their sons, we will take great care of their education, instruct them in all the know, and make men of them.

-Early chief of the Six Nations of the Iroquois-

"Indian people should be able to make their own decisions regarding budget priorities, the operation of their schools, the best use of their land, water and mineral resources, and the direction of their economic development."

"Self government must mean that the majority of decisions affecting Indian tribes will be made in the tribal council room and not in Washington, D.C.. We must obey and implement our treaty obligations."

-Jimmy Carter-

"The white society has had two hundred years to develop an educational system in this country. We've only been given five years in which to catch up."

-Joe Hoptowit, Director,
Indian Heritage High School,
Seattle-

The basis for the federal obligation for Indian education systems from treaties signed developed even before the United States existed. This relationship was exercised under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

The American Indian Journal of the Institute for the Development of Indian Law has traced the first educational provisions to Article II of the Treaty of December 2,1794, between the United States and the Oneida, Tuscarora and Stockbridge tribes.

That clause called the U.S. government to provide a "Person to instruct some young men of the three nations in the arts of the miller and sawyer, and to provide teams and utensils for carrying on the work of the mills."

In order for the colonial government to effectively diminish any threat from tribes, the Indians' entire lifestyle had to be altered. In short, a roving hunting culture must be converted into a stable farming society and an educational process was necessary.

The basis for current federal policy for Indian affairs generally lies with the passage of the Snyder Act in 1921 (P.L. 67-85). This law provides the authority for most BIA activities, including educational responsibilities.

P.L. 73-167, the Johnson-O'Malley Act (JOM) followed in 1934. The law granted supplemental monies to public schools serving Indian populations, but restricted its assistance to students who were members of tribes recognized by the federal government. This point on federal recognition is important not only to the students, but affects school finance in some areas of states with concentrations of Indian population.

In 1972, Congress responded to efforts from tribes and national Indian organizations by passage of P.L. 92-318, the Indian Education Act. Title IV of that law established the Office of Indian Education in the U.S. Office of Education at HEW. Additionally, the title grants special Indian education funds to public schools, tribes and post-secondary institutions, and significantly, established a National Advisory Council on Indian Education (NACIE).

Assistance from the Indian Education Act, Title IV, Part A contributes approximately $35 million in grants to Local Education Agencies. This is the largest amount in the USOE budget earmarked for Indian use.

These monies support special educational program needs of Indians in the public schools. Part A has broad eligibility criteria that includes non-federally recognized Indians and Indians living in areas not currently served by the BIA. This broader interpretation of the law presents problems in identifying eligible Indian students, assessing their speical needs and channeling funds to areas of real deficiency.

The other 2 Title IV sections grant funds to demonstration and alternative school projects under Part B; Part C funds programs for Adult Indian education.

Tribal consensus from the national and regional Indian groups maintain that true advances in the field did not result from the presence of better educational theory, but as a result of the implementation of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, P.L. 93-638.

This law strengthened Indian educational goals and objectives, by giving the government authority to contract educational services to the tribes themselves. This law gave credence to tribal government as a real form of regional jurisdiction and provided tribes with their first opportunities to provide for the educational needs of their own children in terms of their own unique culture. In recent years, 15 such tribally-controlled contract schools are now in operation.

These activities are funded under the BIA's school operations budget under P.L. 93-638. The BIA is directed to provide funds to any tribe or tribal organization which controls and manages any previously private school.

The numbers of these schools is few, but its support has grown tremendously in recent years. The only detrimental factors associated with this trend is that funding for such activities has not risen accordingly.

This movement has also encountered problems with a lack of technical skills and assistance, but such situations could be alleviated by tribes contracting with the former administration of the institution to run the school with Indian guidance and direction.

The growth and success of this trend raises the more basic question: "Who should control Indian education?" In representing Indian priorities, the contract school provides an alternative to both the more centralized BIA/federal system and the public school districts.

In examining the demographics in Indian education, it is quickly apparent that the States now are responsibile for the majority of Indian students, 5 to 1 over any other system. However, the public school offers the least amount of control for Indian parents.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

The total of 360,000 Indian students are presently served by four types of elementary and secondary systems: The Bureau of Indian Affairs, (43,000); the public schools (300,000); Indian controlled "contract" schools (3,000); and mission and private schools (12,000).

The BIA provides services to its students in 114 day schools and 71 boarding schools.

At these levels, over 25,000 students receive their education in these boarding schools. The majority of these students both attend class and live on the school campus. The remainder attend day schools.

The BIA system serves Indians of one-quarter or more Indian blood who are members of tribes currently recognized by the federal government. This recognition serves as the basis for the relationships between tribal and federal government and reinforce those treaty obligations to Indians.

Critics of the BIA system point to numerous studies that point out re-occuring problems within that system. For example, the 1969 report by the Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, "Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge", criticized existing federal and state efforts in Indian education and made policy, administrative and programmatic recommendations.

In 1970, the National Study of American Indian Education by USOE evaluations of the problems encountered in the field and assess Indian priorities in education. That report recommendation strengthening the Indian curriculum, improving career development, finance and teacher recruitment and training.

In 1972, the General Accounting Office declared that the BIA needed to improve the quality of education provided.

The final report of the Indian Education Task Force of the American Indian Policy Review Commission (AIPRC) criticized the BIA system as "inadequate to meet the needs of Indian people."

Statistics included in various surveys of Indian education reveal that the historical policy of BIA has produced Indian achievement levels lower than average and retention rates that fell consistently below public school levels. The 1968 study of Indian achievement in several BIA schools found that in all grades tested, (2, 3, 4 and 5) Indian students scored below the national average. AIPRC findings showed that the dropout rates ranged from 25 to 75 percent.

In all studies and evaluations of Indian education, several questions reoccur with astonishing regularity. These point out administrative and organizational weaknesses: a lack of contemporary educational policy; inadequate management information systems for pupil and staff accountability, curriculum assessment and financial management; inadequate counseling and handicapped resources;

Civil Service regulations that restrict teacher recruitment and replacement; constant replacement of BIA education division director that created a lack of direction and policy; and school construction and maintenance responsibility beyond the jurisdiction of local school administration.

States

During recent decades, state government has increasingly shared in the responsibility for providing education to Indian students. The state systems have received the same criticisms as the federal schools, in that Indians feel that the existing institutions are not meeting their particular cultural and educational needs.

Additionally, parents have correctly charged that the public schools do not allow for realistic input from Indian parents.

The 1966 Colemen Report, On Equality of Educational Opportunity, tested grades 1, 3, 6, 9 and 12, finding that Indian students achievement levels in public schools were consistently lower than those of non-Indian students. The report continued stating that this level was, in fact, increasing.

Indian student support in public schools is a combination of federal ESEA Title I, JOM monies, Title IV Part A funds and whatever state resources are provided by local agencies. Some students are eligible for aid from BIA and Title IV, but others are restricted to Title IV.

the BIA supplies funds through P.L. 73-167, (JOM), of 1934. Of the total 300,000 Indian students enrolled in public schools, 145,000 were funded at $31 million in supplemental monies under JOM.

The program is restricted to serving students of at least one-quarter Indian blood, members of federally recognized tribes, and living in areas currently served by BIA.

Problems in the program cited by Indian educators include misuse of funds by local schools. This is the major point argued by Indians. The local schools

have channeled these funds into basic school support, instead of limiting JOM funds for special projects for Indians. BIA has been additionally criticized for allowing wide variations for state claims in per pupil costs submitted in state JOB budget requests.

The remaining 155,000 Indians in public schools are served by one of three programs administered by the Office of Indian Education: P.L. 81-874, Impact Aid; ESEA Title I and Title IV, the Indian Education Act of 1972.

Impact Aid funds provide almost $60 million to assist 85,000 Indian students in over 600 school districts. These public schools lie adjacent to reservation land and draw not tax revenue from tax-exempt Indian lands for the added load the school system must absorb.

ESEA Title I provides approximately $43 million for Indian students participating in Title I target school programs.

Assistance from the Indian Education Act, Title IV, Part A contributes approximately $35 million in grants to Local Education Agencies (LEAs). This is the largest amount in the USOE budget earmarked for Indian use.

These monies support special educational program needs of Indians in the public shcools. Part A has broader eligibility criteria that includes non-federally recognized Indians and Indians living in areas not served by the BIA. This broader interpretation of the law presents problems in identifying eligible Indian students, assessing their special needs and channeling funds to areas of real deficiency.

The other sections grant funds to demonstration projects under Part B, and Part C funds programs in adult education.

Both Indians and government agree that the eligibility criteria need strengthening, grants need tighter monitoring and Congress needs to outline the precise "special needs of Indian children."

A final concern of Indian students, educators, and parents is that Indian parent advisory boards have little realistic say in the educational development of their children in areas where their political voice is not heard by locally elected school board and administration officials.

II

The Schools

A. Heart of the Earth

The Heart of the Earth Survival School in Minneapolis is one of the most respected examples of the urban Indian effort to maintain cultural heritage and attack the most pressing problems faced by urban Indians in the generally hostile environment. The school is directed by Jim O'Brien, a White Earth Chippewa.

The Ojibwe, Lakota and Winnebago tribes comprise the heaviest Indian population, but by no means are limited to these regional groups. As a result of this regional concentration, the school places a heavy emphasis on these tribes' languages, religion and skills. Of these three tribes, the largest is the Ojibwe.

The Heart of the Earth School was opened in 1972 by the American Indian Movement. O'Brien describes the motivating force as "police brutality to Indians on Franklin Avenue," a section of urban Minneapolis with an extremely high concentration of low-income Indian families.

O'Brien said the school itself was started by local Indian parents who sympathized with AIM objectives. The school's first student body was comprised of 3 students from the same family. The parents had withdrawn the children from public schools in disagreement with their children being taught "fallacies in American history", according to O'Brien.

In that first year, the student enrollment climbed to 35 students and 7 teachers, accomplishing the feat without any funding.

However, from the beginning, the School had its problems. At first, it had no physical plant. O'Brien said that the school classes moved continuously. He said that they used basements, church facilities wherever possible, apartments, drop-in centers, and at one point, a tent.

In 1973, the school received federal funding from Title IV, Part B, the special demonstration project monies. 1973 was the year the Bureau of Indian Affairs building in Washington, D.C., was occupied by members of AIM.

The same year, the school fought claims that the Heart of the Earth was a clearinghouse for channeling funds to an AIM military tactical training center. Their funds were impounded for 18 months until a federal court order released the funds to the school.

The school now receives regular funding under Title IV, but O'Brien is skeptical about the future. "I guess we're getting our fair share now. The thing uppermost in the minds of fundraisers for alternative programs is that Title IV is 'soft money'. It's my understanding that Title IV should be good for another five years, but we certainly can't count on it. That's the kind of money that can be taken away from you at any time, for any reason."

O'Brien felt that the rapport with the public schools was "very good", but had reservations about the relationship with public administration. "Public schools are like any bureaucracy, a large system where people get burned."

The average class size is limited to 20 students. Diversified courses in basic skills, fine arts, etc. are taught with tribally-oriented value systems. The all-Indian classroom creates a comfortable social setting for the students, a rare occurence for the majority of Indian children. Teachers emphasize a communal setting, rather than a rigid class-level structure.

In achieving an effective culturally-oriented education program, O'Brien and his staff favor a balanced approach.

Although most classes can't be taught in a native language, either because of student's unfamiliarity or the language's unsuitability, staff members continuously strive to weave language and culture into every session.

One instructor offered, "There are a lot of Indian-oriented games that use adding and subtracting, multiplying and things like that. We like to touch

all aspects of culture."

He added, "You just can't put a grade of A, B, or C on culture. It's not just one thing, it's an all-day process."

O'Brien said that early in its existence, attempts were made by the public school administration to absorb Heart of the Earth into the Minneapolis alternative school coalition. Heart of the Earth has remained idenpendent of most public administration.

He felt that it was extremely improtant that Heart of the Earth remain independent of the public school structure. O'Brien bluntly stated, "When you get absorbed into the public schools, then you might as well send your children back to the public schools."

Heart of the Earth does, however, participate in the school transportation programs and hot lunch program. O'Brien quickly added that the Minneapolis school system was bound by law to provide those services because of the Indian family's general income and employment situations.

Heart of the Earth also qualifies for funds under the Title IV, Part C, Adult Education Program. The school, additionally, will serve inmates of the state prison and the state reformitories with a General Equivalency Program, life-coping skills for returning inmates, fine arts and culture.

O'Brien hopes to initiate a program for the parents of his students, in order to alleviate the 'uneducation' crisis and to have parents assist their children in their studies.

The student population numbers 140, and the school maintains a waiting list to be enrolled in all classes, pre-school through 12. Class size is limited to 20 and the lower grades are supplied with teacher aides.

For the past year, the school budget totalled $560,000 from a small range of federal programs all from the Department of HEW. O'Brien hopes that anticipated state legislation in Minnesota could begin to provide additional monies

from previously untapped sources.

The Heart of the Earth grants its students the usual high school diploma but O'Brien said that of the samll number of students leaving the school, "none of our students had bothered to do so, thus far." O'Brien continued, citing the fact that several students were now attending local institutions of higher education, including the University of Minnesota. "Colleges do recognize us," he concluded.

O'Brien noted that the Bureau of Indian Affairs had not supplied the school with any funds, through several reasons, but cautioned, "As far as BIA becoming a fiscal agent for us, I really wouldn't care to see that, but that's always a possibility."

O'Brien refuted criticism of militancy training for Indians because of the survival school systems affiliation with the American Indian Movement. "All the schools in the survival school system are AIM affiliated to some degree. I feel there is still a small percentage of people who still think of us as a bunch of radicals who teach militancy, that think that we don't know what we're doing. That's a small percentage and it's getting smaller all the time. The public schools are supportive because they know we're providing services that they cannot provide."

"You see our children here, you see them comfortable and happy. Not being called 'dumb Indian'. They don't have that pressure where they have to watch their backs all the time. I think that's one of the major reasons that we do have a successful program."

O'Brien labelled the Indian community attitude as being "very supportive" but said that this support was not readily available to the school at first. "For the first two or three years, they weren't quite supportive and adopted an attitude of 'let's wait and see if they fall on their face, or if they do have the expertise to pull this off."

Denise R., 14, White Earth Chippewa, is a 9th grade student who has been attending the Heart of the Earth school for 3 years.

Denise is a student who had been removed from the school and returned to the public school, in her words: "For doing something I shouldn't have." She subsequently returned to the Heart of the Earth after an unsuccessful academic year in the Minneapolis school. She spoke of her experience:

"I didn't like it, not the way the white people treat us."

She made her own choice to return to the AIM school family for a reason. "Probably, because I wanted to be with the rest of my brothers and sisters. I've got six other brothers and sisters here, and my mom works here. She's a cook in the kitchen."

Denise saw the primary differences between the systems as being in the flexibility of the curriculum.

"In the public school, you've got to do everything they tell you to do. Here, we've got a choice."

As far as discussing the cultural material, Denise was supportive. She declared, "They teach not just about our culture, but other cultures as well. They teach a lot of our culture, language."

Denise couldn't speak any of her native Objiwe language before entering Heart of the Earth. She has gained confidence with the language, but didn't feel she could converse adequately with tribal elders, "Not yet, but I'm getting there."

Denise felt the school held advantages for her younger brothers and sisters. The main advantage she felt: "Their culture, I guess. They teach a lot of it in the classroom and they couldn't get at white school." She added that the culture could have been learned in her home, but was easier in the school. She remarked that the Minneapolis curriculum had nothing to offer.

"In every class I went to, they were giving math and stuff and I already

knew it. Some of the stuff I did a couple of years ago. In some of the classes I went to, they didn't give my anything. I just sat there, I'd ask for something and they wouldn't give it."

Denise felt that the Heart of the Earth's schedule kept her busy. She said that a typical school day's work was "just about the same as in public school."

Denise added that the important difference in the mornings was the fact that the school started with a traditional ceremony to begin the day, the cultural equivalent of the public schools salute to the Flag.

Mornings began at 9 o'clock, the day's five classes each lasted forty-five minutes. The activities included both a home room period and a study period. Four of the courses were mandatory in conjunction with state requirements. Electives filled the remainder of the day.

The mandatory curriculum includes English, Social Studies, Math and Health. Several elective courses are available, but those are limited to two per trimester per student. The school maintains an agreement with nearby Marshall High School to provide such electives as typing, drivers education and photography.

Denise was uncertain about career plans, but felt that the education provided by the Heart of the Earth School would help her in making career decisions.

B. Hans Christian Anderson

In their efforts to provide quality cultural education the public school system of Minneapolis, the Indian Staff of Hans Christian Anderson elementary school use three different educational approaches; contemporary (Program A); continuous progress (B); and modified (C). Students with special adjustment or learning problems are assisted in a separate education unit.

A total of 2352 Indian students were served in the Title IV Indian education programs. The bulk of students served, live in the east, west and north areas of the city. The rest of the Indian student populations are in various transitional-type institutions correctional homes, hospitals and other schools.

Tribal influence from the Ojibwe and Winnebago is predominant and curriculum material developed by the school's Indian curriculum project reflect this regional emphasis.

For example, tribal legends are used for both cultural content, and for reading development. These legends are designed as supplemental language arts materials for the early elementary students, but additionally, would appeal to non-Indian readers for any age groups.

In "The Legend of the Owl", an Ojibwe legend is retold by a woman from the MilleLacs reservation. It additionally is accompanied by an illustration by an artist from the same reservation. Additional units discuss Native Americans of the twentieth century to provide students with a link to contemporary extensions of their culture.

There units consist of two separate parts, a biographical folder and a teacher's guide for each biography. The folders consist of a photograph of the person, a biographical sketch and other information. The teacher's guide contains student activities and direction, along with suggestions for teaching the units. Emphasis is upon contemporary Dakota, Ojibwe and Winnebago people.

Language skills are taught by accredited teachers working in conjunction with teacher aides. All are proficient in the subject language.

In one method, the Ojibwe language was used in a "bingo" form of exercise. Students had to correctly respond to Ojibwe names for objects depicted on their bingo cards. The class was approximately one-half non-Indian. Winners were evenly distributed among Indians and non-Indians.

Instructors had commented that parents of white children participating in these language skill classes were amazed that their children were learning authentic Indian language.

C. Highline Indian Tutoring Program

The Highline Indian tutoring program is designed to provide academic assistance to Indian students of the Highline School district of Seattle's northern section. It is funded by the Office of Indian Education.

The program supplies tutors who work with Indian students for two hours a week on a one-to-one basis to help improve the student's skills in reading and mathematics.

The program, now is in its third year, uses high school students, college students and certified teachers as tutors for Indian elementary and secondary students.

According to project director Roger Hernandez, the objective of eliminating Indian underachievement is being reached.

For example, the program's second year, 87 per cent of the students enrolled showed improvement in math after 14 weeks in the program. The program staff has reported that 84 per cent of those enrolled during the same period showed significant improvement in reading skills as well. These figures were derived through the nationally-recognized Stanford Achievement Test.

In discussing the problems faced by the Indian students, Hernandez said that past assessments of Indian student progress indicated that Indian students in public schools were almost uniformly one year behind other students across the state.

Because of the traditional family structure and child-rearing practices, Indians tend to be reserved, quiet and shy. This tendency, when surfacing in a predominantly white classroom keeps the Indian student in the background, afraid to speak up when not comprehending a lesson, for fear of being labelled as "dumb". This also prevents students from responding even in situations when the student knows the correct answer.

The ideal situation would have an all-Indian staff to handle the tutoring assignments, but so far, response from Indians has been slight. Last year, the majority of tutors were non-Indians, but in 1978, the percentage of Indians instructing Indian students has risen significantly.

Indian direction of the project provides the cultural sensitivity that the student tutors need to reach the students.

In a discussion of the educational program necessary for student tutors, Cathy Ross, project manager, said that the tutors' must pass a rigorus session in education methods.

The course outline includes training to determine student's academic abilities, preparing a teaching plan and implementation and testing. Methods include a variety of recreational exercises, structured learning materials and a reward system to provide stimulation.

Student tutors are required to pass ten hours of special training in these instructional skills and gain familiarity with Indian culture.

Objectives outlined in program materials include:

(1) 70 percent of students receiving two units, (14 hours of private tutoring through out an 8-week term) should demonstrate a gain of approximately 6 months achievement in the skill area in which they are tutored.

(2) deliver two hundred seventy tutoring units to deficient students.

(3) 85 percent of the untrained tutors who receive four hours of cultural training will achieve a post test score on the Tutor's Test of Native American Culture Knowledge of 85 percent correct responses or higher.

(4) The Indian tutoring program provides continuing diagnostic and prescriptive instructional support services for all tutors to assist in their planning of appropriate activities to use in conducting their tutorial programs.

Indian students in grades 1 - 12 with basic skill deficiencies can receive two hours of tutoring per week from student tutors or adult tutors for a total

of twenty-four weeks. The time period is organized into three intensive eight-week segments, corresponding to the fall, winter, and spring quarters of higher education institutions. The majority of participating American Indian students served by the program are tutored twice a week for one or more quarters.

The certified adult tutors travel twice a week to the schools their Indian students attend, where a student is excused from a specific class to receive individual attention in that subject area. The adult tutors work primarily with secondary students, while the high school and college students tutor the elementary students.

Student tutors arrive at the center one-half hour early to plan their activities. Two certified teachers, called tutor advisors, work with the student tutors, providing resources for each session. Following each session the children are taken by bus to their homes.

Indian students attending each Highline district school are listed and these are circulated to the administration counseling staff of each school. This list provides the recommendations for referral after the appropriate official and teachers have been consulted. Parental requests are also used as a source for identifying potential candidates for the tutorial program. Parents are advised for the criteria for inclusion in the program through letters and personal contacts, and their approval is obtained before a child can participate in the program.

Current criteria include:

(1) Wish to be in the tutoring program.

(2) Be recommended for tutoring by a counselor, teacher or parent.

(3) Have parental approval to participate in the program.

(4) Meet the deficient achievement criteria for inclusion in the tutoring program.

Accompanying criteria for inclusion in the tutoring program:

Primary Grades: At least two months below grade level as measured by standardized testing.

Intermediate Grades: At least four months below grade level.

Junior Grades: At least six months below grade level.

High School Grades: At least eight months below grade level.

In implementing the program, a list of candidates is compiled and those students who are designated by the judgement of counselors and teachers as most likely to benefit from the services are assigned a tutor, with the remainders being placed on a prioritized waiting list. Program criteria demands that students who achieve academic performance comparable with the rest of the school children must be removed from the program and the rest of the students advance to fill the vacancy.

The explicit training program the students tutors undergo usually contains:

(1) Relating constructively to younger children

(2) Helping students accept instruction

(3) Realistic levels of expectation for a particular age or grade

(4) Usuage of SARI reading skills management system

(5) Encouragement in correction of errors, rather than discouragement

(6) Communication with teachers of students being tutored

(7) Diagnosing specific areas of skill deficiency

(8) Usage of precise instructional techniques to assist students in achieveing goals

(9) Positive reinforcement

The program requires four hours of cultural training. This training focuses on gaining a better familiarity with Indian cultural heritage and value systems and especially how they may affect the Indian children they will tutor.

The Highline cultural curriculum consists of:

(1) Brief history of the Indian people

(2) Overview of the life-styles of four American Indian clutures at the time of European contact.

(3) Background information on the American Indian migration into the large cities.

(4) Traditionalist, moderate and progressive attitudes and positions

(5) How the Indian child is "caught between two worlds"

(6) Problems created by media "stereotypes"

(7) Problems with racial insensitivity in the public schools

(8) Culturally different learning style of Indians

(9) Culturally effective teaching styles for tutors to use with Native American children.

At the end of the training sessions prospective tutors must score a minimum of 85 percent correct on the Tutor's Test of Native American Cultural Knowledge.

A variety of instructional resources are made available for use by tutors. At Highline, these include instructional games, manipulative learning aids, math and reading resource books, teaching techniques for use in individual tutoring sessions, culturally relevant reading materials, and suggestion for tutoring.

The Highline staff has organized and catalogued these resources by basic skill and difficulty level to assist in selection of appropriate learning experience for each student and as one measure of student achievement.

According to the Evaluation data prepared by Ross, the data for the 1977-78 school year indicated that 92.9 percent of the participating students show significant gains in reading comprehension and 86 percent of the students show a significant gain in math computation ability.

The Highline Indian Education Office provides a Native American curriculum kit for classroom teachers' use for the majority of the school system. The kit is to provide teachers with accurate material to teach about Indians and their culture, both past and present. The Highline staff provides an additional inservice training session for the teachers to explain the material in depth before the teachers begin the unit for their class.

D. Indian Heritage High School

Indian education efforts have an outstanding example to follow from the Seattle Indain Heritage High School (IHHS). The school is one stable effort by local Indian parents in cooperation with the local school district, to gain control of Indian education, while still within the public school administration.

According to Joe Hoptowit, director of IHHS, the school provides a classroom social peer group, similar to Heart of the Earth, but entirely within the public school system. This relaxed atmosphere, usually taken for granted by white students, is the main advantage, according to Hoptowit.

He mentioned that placing Indian students in this kind of comfortable classroom setting eliminates the inhibiting social factors that would have kept Indian students quiet, shy and labelled as "unresponsive" in the white classroom.

The school itself differs little from the usual large metropolitan, residentially-located high school. IHHS occupies the top floor of a local senior high school and is relatively unidentified, except for a small sign in the school's main entrance lobby.

The inter-tribal student enrollment numbers a little over one hundred. Students attend IHHS by parental request or referral from the school system.

Curriculum varies little from state-mandated course requirements, but is taught with strong cultural support through native studies courses in art, language, dance and crafts. The school uses a combination of certified instructors and local community resource people and has become highly regarded by local Indians because of the community involvement.

When questioned about the school's effectiveness on the tremendous problems faced by Indian students, Hoptowit estimated that IHHS had reduced the dropout rate by only a small percentage for the entire school district, but within IHHS, the rate had been significantly lowered.

The dropout rate was only an initial indicator, Hoptowit added, the demonstration of the school's success came with an examination of the student achievement rate.

Test scores for IHHS students were perceptibly higher than those scores of Indian students enrolled in other schools, attesting to the fact that within such culturally-socailly comfortable setting, Indian student achievement was comparable with acceptable academic standards for the rest of the school system.

Such an ideal setting is not without the problems related to funding, labor restriction and guidelines that impose restrictions on the student populations served, Hoptowit cautioned.

Funding is provided by a combination of federal monies and local school district funds.

Restrictions on the use of these funds, however, has created staffing problems for the school. Indian instructors are at a premium and consequently offered sums substantially higher than public schools offer to work for tribes and Indian organizations.

The local teachers union, an NEA affiliate, has imposed its union restrictions on the school district hiring practices, freezing negotiations for instructors for IHHS. Hoptowit has gained some exceptions to these restrictions, but staffing still remains a severe problem under an indifferent administration.

Finally, the current HEW and BIA definitions used for student eligibility for federal programs, maintains an unsteady financial situation and once again reintroduces the question of "federally recognized or non-federally recognized". There is a substantial percentage of both groups in the Seattle area.

The program is highly regarded by both city educators and administrators. IHHS has received several referrals from those people lending the project some credence.

IHHS students have formed several cultural performing units. These groups preserve traditional dance and songs from a variety of tribes and perform for other segments of the educational system and are recognized throughout the city.

III

New Laws

Indian efforts at self-determination face an uncertain year, according to Indian education groups, administration officials and the Congress.

The recent defeat of S.991, of the Department of Education gives no respite from apprehensions about "fragmentation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs." The issue at hand is the removal of Indian education programs from the trust agency charged to the United States legal obligations to Indians.

Last year's proposed actions would have removed enormous portions of BIA's budget and staff, placing them in the proposed Cabinet level department. Figures ran upwards to $271 million in BIA funds for education.

Indians solidly opposed any such transfer, fearing that this was to be the initial step on the part of the Administration to dismantle the BIA.

The President's staff and the President's Reorganization Project had consistently and publicly advised Indians since last year, that there were no intentions of transferring BIA education from the Department of Interior. Tribes recalled the Carter campaign promise of self-determination of tribal governments.

As the bill was introduced, skeptical Indian organizations discovered that the bill did include provisions to transfer the BIA education programs.

The National Congress of American Indians analyzed the trend and pronounced that the move was the first step in a "systematic Administrative plan to transfer as many as 30 areas of service delivery out of the BIA, in effect, a systematic dismantling of the Indian bureau, a major move toward an ultimate termination for Indian tribes."

The Administrative and Congressional rationale for the transfer was the poor performance record of the BIA system, according to numerous reports. It

was felt that a comprehensive approach to Indian education could best be served within the new department. The new department would have no conflict of interest, as was being felt in the Interior department.

Indian charges stated that the Administration was attempting to reduce the federal responsibility for Indian affairs to a mere agency level function similar to functions conducted for minority-action programs within the government and not the binding legal relationship dictated by treaty provisions. Tribal sovereignty would be fatally eroded, tribes said.

Indian groups also struck out at Congress, citing continued attempts to transfer the programs as being representative of "backlash" movement against Indians and a Congressional "cooling off" toward Indian advocacy.

Leading the charge against the move was the National Congress of American Indians, the National Indian Education Association, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards, the National Tribal Chairmen's Association Education Component and over 150 tribal resolutions in opposition to such a move.

National Conventions in Rapid City, S.D. and Niagara Falls, N.Y.

In national conventions, the National Congress of American Indians, at Rapid City, S.D.; The National Indian Education Association, in Niagara Falls, N.Y.; and the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards, in Denver unanimously opposed any governmental efforts to change the existing relationship with BIA.

One of the largest Indian lobbying efforts in history met with success as first the House deleted the transfer provisions in committee, and the Senate followed suit in an 11th-hour vote on the Floor.

Even after the Congressional rebuff of the transfer, Indians continued to feel anxious as concerns over possible administrative authority and intentions to transfer the programs in spite of all opposition.

The Administration has remained silent on the subject. Even the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs at Interior and the Director of the Office of Indian Education were not informed or, as of yet, consulted about the future form of the legislation.

An interesting sidelight to the debate on the issue, is the fact that James Abourezk, champion of Indian causes, chose to support the measure. The former Senator from South Dakota termed the decisions, "one of the most difficult decisions I have made since I have been in politics."

He added that it marked the "first time I have significantly departed from that policy."

Indian efforts on other educational fronts met with substantial success. The passage of H.R. 15 signalled the promise of much-needed reforms in the areas cited by the numerous examinations of Indian education.

Title XI of the law contains three sections affecting: Part A, assistance to Local Educational Agencies; Part B, Bureau of Indian Affairs programs; and Part C, Indian education provisions under Title IV of the Indian Education Act.

Part A deals with impact aid funds. It amends the law to provide for more Indian parent involvement and input in the public schools. This section would answer one of the most critical questions faced by Indian education. How to gain more control in the public system to provide more Indian direction. The law requires every LEA receiving monies under Part A to implement procedures guaranteeing:

(1) Equal treatment and equal participation in all programs by Indian students.

(2) Indian tribal and parental consultation and involvement in the planning and development of all programs impacting Indian students.

(3) Parental and tribal opportunities to make recommendations on their views on the needs of their children and their methods for meeting those needs.

(4) Parents and tribes being afforded an opportunity to monitor and evaluate programs including the specific operation of programs (day-to-day classroom operation).

Under this section, a tribe has the right to file a complaint with the Commissioner of Education based on any failure or breach in the policies and procedures established. This includes cases where policies do not have meaningful imput. This is a subjective term, but is is specifically mentioned in the law. Failure to provide "meaningful input" immediately grants the tribes the options of withdrawing their children from the schools and having the BIA provide the educational services, or providing the services themselves through a 638 contract.

The law increases payment by one-quarter of the current rate, but these funds are tied to increased Indian parental input.

Part B requires BIA school system reforms in eight basic areas:

(1) BIA is not required to establish standards for academic programs and home living situations. The language of the section calls for immediate implementation upon finalization of regulations. BIA is required to submit to Congressional oversight committees information concerning costs and time requirements for all standard proposed.

(2) Contract schools will be exempt from BIA standards.

(3) The BIA is required to bring all of its facilities up to appropriate health and safety standards of the state, federal or tribal government, whichever provides the most protection for students.

(4) The BIA internal structure is realigned to place all control over education within BIA to be placed under the director of BIA's education division in Washington, D.C. and not under regional Area Directors.

(5) A funding formula is to be established and all monies are to be channeled directly to schools.

(6) Educational personnel are to be no longer hired under the cumbersome Civil Service system. Staff is to be hired locally, with local school board input. The tribes are granted the right to waive academic requirements when using tribal members teaching culturally-related courses. In addition, tribes are granted the right to waive Indian preference regulations when necessary.

(7) The BIA is required to initiate an effective management information system.

(8) Educational policies are now required and they must have enough scope to include support services divisions.

Part C of the bill amended Title IV to extend the authority for another five years, until 1983.

Perhaps the most important section of the law has been amended. The section containing the definition of "Indian" for eligibility purposes has been amended with the phrase, "now or in the future" removed from the definition. The results of this amendment could bar currently "unrecognized" tribes from future participation in Title IV, Part C programs. This change does not bar any children from participating in Title IV programs.

The question of federal recognition has not been settled and this move places the question in a state of "limbo", while Indian input is to be secured to settle the issue. One of the laws provisions calls for an examination of the question.

The definition of special academic needs has been expanded to now include culturally-related academic needs.

Eligibility for participation in demonstration grant competition, as well as, entitlements under Part A LEA monies has been expanded. Now public schools may compete for demonstration project money, and conversely, Indian contract and alternative schools may now compete for regular LEA funds.

Finally, a cultural concession to the traditional concern of the extended family has been combined with a realistic assessment of the current condition of many Indian family situations. Relatives serving in the capacity of parents may now have a voice on parent committees and school boards. The legal term, "in loco parentis", has been added to that section. It now requires that persons serving in this parental capabity must be consulted in decisions under programs funded under this Act. Grandparents, foster parents, aunts and uncles may now have input into the hiring of personnel.

The Indian post-secondary efforts were given credence with the passage of P.L. 95-471, the Tribal Community College Act. Alan Lovesee, Counsel to the Advisory Study Group on Indian Education of the House Committee on Education and Lobor attributed its passage to the lengthy efforts of Indian groups. The concept and test of the law will provide funding to tribes who express the desire and necessity for post-secondary schools on their reservation.

Upon the request of a tribe, the Secretary of Interior must conduct feasibility studies as to the needs of a post-secondary school on that particular reservation. The establishment of a tribe's need and the adequacy of the intended service population would rest on a flexible basis. That flexibility will extend to the tribe's size and location, plus feasible alternatives. If approved, the schools would be eligible for grants of $4,000 per full-time student. That figure would be paid directly to the school.

The Interior Department is also directed to assess needs and make recommendations for useage of construction funds. Appropriations are set for $25 million for the first two years and $30 million for the third year.

The Navajo Community College, the nation's oldest, will be included in the law. It will be funded under its own section and will not compete for funds with the other schools.

IV

View From The Top

A.

While attending the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Board National Convention, Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Forrest Gerard, (Blackfeet), discussed the recent appointment of a new director of the Indian Education division at the Bureau of Indian affairs and gave his opinions and predictions for Indian education in the upcoming year.

Gerard revealed that Earl Barlow, (also a Blackfeet), had been in professional Indian education for his entire career. Barlow is a former classroom teacher in public schools in northwestern Montana. He first served the Flathead reservation and then became a public school administrator for the state Department of Public Instruction, heading the Department of Indian Education.

"One of the significant accomplishments of his tenure," Gerard said, "was that he converted the use of Johnson-O'Malley funds in that state from operation support to supplemental use. He was instrumental in getting parental committees established even before the amendment in Title II, P.L. 93-683, the Self-Determination Act."

"He later accepted the position of the superintendent of public schools on the Blackfeet reservation. It was always his intention that someday he wanted to go back there and try and turn that school district around," Gerard observed. "The Blackfeet district is the largest Indian public school district in the State of Montana, over 90 percent Indian enrollment."

"Earl's view was that there was sufficient federal funding from the various federal sources in that system, but what was needed was a revision of the curriculum, stabilizing the faculty, the whole physical plant. I believe to that end, Earl has achieved phenomenal success. I believe he's widely recognized by his peers throughout the Indian education world. In our view, he represents

an outstanding person for the post."

Gerard felt comfortable with the selection process and the number of candidates available. "We looked over, maybe, a half a dozen individuals in the field before we narrowed it down to him."

When questioned about the large number of administrators holding the position previous to Barlow's selection, Gerard responded, "I think you've put your finger on some of the real fundamental problems in that bureau. The prolonged period in which 'acting' people heading up the bureau prevented them from addressing some of the real issues in the trust area, trying to attack some of the public administration problems in education."

"The prolonged period in which it was an acting person has not helped u . I believe that Earl (Barlow) is that kind of professional who will be able to fit in and start bringing some stability to the education field in BIA."

Gerard then discussed recently approved legislation mandating several reforms in the BIA education system.

"I think that Title XI (of H.R. 15), coupled with some of the tough management improvement efforts that we have underway, will fit in very well."

However, the Assistant Secretary had resernations about the total scope of Title XI, specifically the granting of line authority to the BIA education director by placement of all BIA educational personnel under the Central Office director. The bill removed the Area Director's authority in those issues.

"I had some serious misgivings about the direct line authority question. That's going to be a little tricky, but I view many of the other provisions as very useful in bringing about criteria standards. No one should argue against that. I think all of that will help strengthen Indian education."

In reply to questions on the "tricky" part of the direct line authority structure, Gerard said, "It sort of gives you a 'bureau within a bureau', if you see what I'm getting at. It's going to be an interesting public

administration challenge to se how we work it out."

Gerard continued, "We have a very ambitous plan in moving forward quickly on H.R. 15. I thind that most people who have become aware of it are reasonably impressed that we are truly seeking input from a wide range of the Indian community. A lot of the bureau staff who want change feel encouraged about the way in which we are approaching it. With the tight time frame, we're going to give it a high priority. The implementation is going to be handled out of my office. Over a two to three year period, there's a lot of work that must be accomplished."

Gerard cautioned, "I don't want to give any false expectations, but I would hope that within a year that we are going to be seeing some re-direction of things."

Gerard then began outlining his concerns for the new year.

"We propose to take some steps soon on the off-reservation boarding school. I want Barlow to be thinking about some kind of 'blue ribbon' panel to take a real hard look at those schools." he commended.

The BIA boarding school enrollment has dropped approximately 9,000 students over the last 10 years. Gerard attributed this change to the construction of schools close to the students homes, but conceded that BIA still had an enormous backlog of projects that had not been addressed.

In mentioning the boarding schools' various problems Gerard spoke of problems inherent in the student populations.

"The thing that bothers me is that we know that many students in the boarding schools are public school dropouts, serious psychological and behaviorial problems, through no fault of their own. Maybe, the next stop would be a state institution, and in effect, what the bureau is serving, in terms of those students in many instances, is as an alternative school. Amazingly enough, they're moving some of those students through to graduation."

"On the other hand," he continued, "we have had such unfortunate situations such as Chilocco, (Oklahoma), where we've had a couple of brutal murders. Let's face up to the realities of what we're dealing with. We need a school, a facility and a program to deal with these children."

"We're putting behaviorial problem students under the guise of a normal boarding school operation. We're paying the price with the problems and trauma that emerges."

Gerard then followed with a warning that funding would present a problem. "It's no secret that the administration's going for a lean budget for the 1980 fiscal year. It seems to me that if we justify the need for this kind of facility, it's going to be our burden, together with the Indian community. The Congress is also going to have to face up to this. If we separated out those kinds of students and say let's put them in a separate program and facility that would be more fitting, then we're all going to have to carry the burden and try to get the funding for it."

In discussing the forecast for the upcoming legislative calendar, Gerard was unsure what to expect from the White House. He noted that President Carter was expected to reintroduce the Department of Education legislation, but could elaborate as to whether the bill would again contain the BIA education division transfer.

"I've not been consulted on this directly, and I understand that there has been some speculation on this, but I understand he might send that bill up in the State of the Union message."

Gerard declared that he would repeat his stance of opposing the transfer during any discussions of the bill within the Interior department.

"I think that the message was clear from the Indian community and the Congress that they supported desires that the transfer not take place. I know what my recommendation is going to be. Not based on any great performance on

the part of the bureau. That record's there."

He then mentioned the Indian tribes and organizations fears over division of the BIA. "I've taken the position that this question transcends more than just education issues. You start segregating out and this represents a form of fragmentation of the trust organization."

Gerard's view on a possible White House policy statement for Indians were discouraging. "I would doubt very much that there is going to be a national Indian policy statement. Quite frankly, I don't think that I would be too wise to press for it right now, given the climate we're dealing in. It seems to me that we have many broad authorities and with some creative thinking, we can do a lot with these. But, for my part, I'm not pressing for a message at this point."

His priority concerns were focused on addressing the current "backlash" and other attempts to erode the legal basis for the relationship between Indians and the government.

"It's no secret that we've got this conflict between the Department of Interior and the Department of Justice over the scope of the trust responsibility. To me, that's really the most critical issue that's before us in the field today. If the trust responsibility is narrowed in scope, then we would unfortunately see the erosion of sovereignty. What would happen to our water, jurisdiction, and a lot of other things that are important to the maintenance of Indian communities?"

As far as education performance was concerned, Gerard said, "I'm concerned, as the overall head of Indian affairs, about the high dropout rates, the poor performance of Indian students even after they graduate and go on to college. That's not to say that there aren't exceptions."

"It would seem to me that we must begin asking ourselves, "Why?" Why the high dropout rate and attack that. What are the problems that contribute to

poor performance and see what steps need to be taken. Is it curriculum? Is it bi-cultural? ..just to strengthen our basic program so that we turn out students who can compete, academically or vocationally, whatever path they choose to follow."

When asked about his thoughts on implementing the Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (Gerard was one of the authors of the legislation while serving on the Senate staff) Gerard commented, "I guess my greatest disappointment, now that I'm on this side of the street, is seeing the inordinate amount of detail that we've associated with the Act. That's made it cumbersome, and unfortunately, given some attitudinal problems on the part of some bureau employees. There are many ways they can frustrate a tribe's or tribal organization's desire to opt to use provisions of that Act. We're taking a hard look at some of those obstacles. We hope to smooth it out."

B.

In providing a review of the future action in Indian education, Dr. Gerald Gipp, (Standing Rock Sioux) Director of the Office of Indian Education at HEW, advised that Congress was moving towards examination of Indian-run programs and analyzing results. He stated that all emotional arguments for Indian program support have been exhausted and Congressional oversight committees now wanted to "know what they were getting for their money."

Gipp spoke of this Congressional interest in mid-fall meetings at the National Congress of American Indians National Convention in Rapid City, S.D. and repeated his concerns at the National Indian Education Association Convention in Niagara Falls, N.Y..

He predicted that Indian programs must "systematize" and document information to present before appropriations and education committees on Capitor Hill to insure future funding levels for those projects.

His predictions of substantial changes in Title IV regulations had become real by early December when he spoke to the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards, in Denver.

Gipp's status report examined the changes in the regulations for Title IV projects in response to Indian suggestions to open eligibility categories to release funds to a greater number of Indian education projects.

Public schools now had the opportunity to compete for part of a 10 per cent set-aside of the demonstration project funds that have previously gone only to tribes and alternative schools. He quickly added that no funds would be diverted from the demonstration schools projects. Additionally, an existing priority point system favoring schools with the greatest need would not be changes.

"An amendment to the law broadens the scope under Part A to provide assistance, not only for the special educational needs of Indian students, but also

includes their culturally related academic needs. I understand that the purpose of adding that terminology was to clarify the inclusion of cultural activity as a legitimate activity that should be pursued under Title IV."

Gipp felt that the changes would counter Congressional and Administration inquiries as to the validity of these types of expenditures.

"An amendment to speak to tribal schools is one that provides that Indian controlled schools under granted status as Local Educational Agencies for the purpose of receiving Part A entitlement payments. These schools shall also remain eligible to compete for other program monies under a 10 per cent set-aside currently in the Act."

"Due to the increased number of contract and alternative shcools in the past five years, the problems some schools have in obtaining competitive grants would be lessened by the eligibility for additional funds," Gipp noted.

In amending the definition of "Indian" used for eligibility criteria for Indian programs, Gipp remarked that the changes not critical.

"There was some concern...about the definition of 'Indian". Some minor changes were made that really had no impact on the definition itself. It simply excluded some terminology." he concluded.

FORD FELLOWS IN EDUCATIONAL JOURNALISM: A DESCRIPTION

This report is based upon work done for the 1978 Ford Fellows in Educational Journalism Program. Each year the Fellowship offers a selected group of educational journalists a three-month Fellowship program designed to strengthen the educational media by providing additional resources to working reporters and their news organizations.

The Fellowship is a unique opportunity for educational journalists to go beyond the local news of school board votes and teachers' strikes to undertake a comprehensive study of an issue of major significance to the schools and the society they serve. It is an individually tailored program in which journalists select topics of concern to them and their public, to explore through site visits to relevant programs throughout the country, meetings with national experts and authorities, and exposure to current research and background literature. Individual study plans are supplemented by monthly Fellowship seminars that focus on educational issues of interest to the Journalism Fellows and provide time to share and discuss study experiences. In addition to stories based upon the Fellowship, which journalists may choose to do for their news organizations, the program publishes a monograph of Fellowship reports and articles.

Initiated by The Ford Foundation's Advisor on Communications, Fred W. Friendly (formerly of CBS News), and its Vice President for Education, Harold Howe II (former U.S. Commissioner of Education), the Fellowship is a novel, experiential approach to strengthening the educational media. By providing journalists with time and resources for study and travel, the Fellowship seeks to:

*encourage the development of a knowledgeable and effective educational press, equipped to bring both analytical depth and national context to local news coverage;

*provide experienced journalists with an opportunity to conduct a thorough analysis of an issue which will help to clarify and answer some of the questions facing the country's $165 billion education industry.

The Fellowship is coordinated by the George Washington University's Institute for Educational Leadership. IEL program administrators are available to assist Journalism Fellows in designing and conducting their individual study programs and arrange for monthly Fellowship Seminars.

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Suite 310
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Samu[illegible]in
Directo
(202) 833-1737

Education Policy
Fellowship Program
(202) 223-3415

Educational Staff Seminar
(202) 293-3166

The Associates Program
(202) 785-4991

Postsecondary Education
Convening Authority
(202) 833-2745

"Options in Education"
over National Public Radio
(202) 785-6462

Education of the Handicapped
Policy Project
(202) 833-1737

Family Impact Seminar
(202) 296-5330

Washington Policy Seminar
(202) 833-9051

FORD FELLOWS IN EDUCATIONAL JOURNALISM
1978

	Name	News Organization	Study Topic
1.	Huntly Collins	The Oregonian Portland, OR	Gifted & Talented Education
2.	James Covington	The Commercial Appeal Memphis, TN	Competency-Based Education
3.	Joe Donovan	KYW News Radio Philadelphia, PA	Basic Skills
4.	Gary Fife	United Indian Planners News Washington, DC	Indian Education
5.	Robert Frahm	The Journal Times Racine, WI	Competency-Based Education
6.	Diane Granat	Chicago Daily Herald Arlington Heights, IL	Parent Power
7.	Saundra Ivey	The Tennessean Nashville, TN	School Finance: Tax Revolt Issues
8.	Rick Janka	The Milwaukee Sentinel Milwaukee, WI	Achieving Quality Education
9.	Rosa Morales	KCET Television Los Angeles, CA	Desegregation
10.	Ethel Payne	St. Louis Sentinel Newspapers St. Louis, MO	Black Colleges
11.	Donald Speich	Los Angeles Times Los Angeles, CA	Effect of Proposition 13
12.	Monte Trammer	The Baltimore Sun Baltimore, MD	Declining Enrollment School Closing
13.	Linda Williams	Daily Herald/South Mississippi Sun Biloxi, MS	School Finance Patterns in the South

FORD FELLOWS IN EDUCATIONAL JOURNALISM
1976

Name	News Organization	Study Topic
1. David Bednarek	The Milwaukee Journal Milwaukee, WI	Desegregation
2. Michael Bowler	The Sun Baltimore, MD	Textbook Select
3. Helen Carringer	The Beacon Journal Akron, OH	Parent Power
4. James A. Killacky	The Daily Oklahoman Oklahoma, OK	Teacher Unions
5. Jacquelyn King	WRR News Radio Dallas, TX	Testing
6. Andrew Miller	The Kansas City Star Kansas City, KS	Testing
7. Lael Morgan	Tundra Times Fairbanks, AK	Bilingual Educat
8. Linda Stahl	The Courier-Journal Louisville, KY	Basic Skills
9. Stanley Wellborn	U.S. News & World Report Washington, D.C.	Federal Educatio Policy

FORD FELLOWS IN EDUCATIONAL JOURNALISM
1977

Name	News Organization	Study Topic
1. Constantine Angelos	The Seattle Times Seattle, WA	Basic Skills
2. Muriel Cohen	The Boston Globe Boston, MA	Teacher Educatio
3. Rebecca Kuzins	The Muskegon Chronicle Muskegon, MI	Special Educatio
4. Lorenzo Middleton, Jr.	The Washington Star Washington, D.C.	Desegregation
5. Cynthia Parsons	The Christian Science Monitor Boston, MA	School Finance
6. Wayne F. Reilly	The Bangor Daily News Bangor, ME	Competency Based Testing
7. Dale Alan Rice	The Post-Standard Syracuse, NY	Magnet Schools

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036

(Send check or purchase order)

IEL Policy Papers

1. Perspectives on Federal Educational Policy: An Informal Colloquium
An examination of the forms and mechanics of federal policy processes. by Robert Andringa, Chester E. Finn Jr., Samuel Halperin, Michael Timpane, Thomas Wolanin. August 1976 ..... $1.50

2. Federalism at the Crossroads: Improving Educational Policymaking
An anthology of critiques and prescriptions for strengthening the intergovernmental system in education. December 1976 ..... $3.00

3. Education Policy and The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142)
A Report of Regional Policy Conferences, January-April 1977 ..... $2.50

4. Language, Ethnicity, and the Schools: Policy Alternatives for Bilingual-Bicultural Education
An analysis of the federal role in bilingual-bicultural education. by Noel Epstein. August 1977 ..... $4.00

5. Educational Policy in the Carter Years
Experts analyze the decisionmaking process in Washington and the Carter Administration's performance and future prospects. by Christopher Cross, William Blakey, Samuel Halperin, Gregory Humphrey, John Jennings, George Kaplan, Aims McGuinness, Jr., Michael O'Keefe, Charles Saunders, Jr., September 1978 ..... $4.00

6. Needed: A New Federal Policy for Higher Education
Analysis and recommendations for federal directions in higher education. by Joseph Froomkin. September 1978 ..... $4.00

Other IEL Publications

Taking Sexism Out of Education
Identification and analysis of sex discrimination issues at the elementary and secondary level. National Project on Women in Education. August 1978 ..... No charge for single copy (send $.50 for postage)

Women in Educational Leadership: An Open Letter to State Legislators
Leadership Training Institute. August 1975 ..... $2.50

Handbook on How to End Sexism in Your Schools
Leadership Training Institute. August 1975 ..... $2.50

Hierarchy, Power and Women in Educational Policy Making
Leadership Training Institute. August 1975 ..... $3.00

Essays on Federal Education Policy
by Samuel Halperin. May 1975 ..... $1.50

Training Educational Leaders: A Search for Alternatives
Leadership Training Institute. November 1976 ..... No charge for single copy (send $.50 for postage)

Report of the P.E.C.A. Task Force on Lifelong Learning
The Postsecondary Education Convening Authority, by Barbara Hodgkinson, Peg Kaplin, Ian McNett and George Nolfi. February 1977 ..... $3.00

Nontraditional Education: State-Level Issues and Concerns
A Conference held at the Harvard University Graduate School of Education. The Postsecondary Education Convening Authority $1.00

Approaches to State Licensing of Private Degree-Granting Institutions
The Airlie Conference Report Postsecondary Education Convening Authority. November 1975 ..... $2.00

The Incentive Grant Approach to Higher Education: A 15-Year Record
Postsecondary Education Convening Authority by Martin Finkelstein. December 1975 ..... $2.00

Improvements of Education in Poland and Romania
Report of the Educational Staff Seminar Study Mission. October 1976 ..... $3.00

Improvements of Education in Cuba
ESS Study Mission. December 1976 ..... $3.50

Education Policy Fellowship Program (EPFP)
Telephone: 676-5925
Education Policy Fellowship Program (EPFP) (formerly Washington Internships in Education) is a national program designed to help provide future leaders the skills in policymaking they must have to exert effective and enlightened leadership in American education. Funds for the program are provided by the Ford, Rockefeller, and Cleveland Foundations, and other grantors.

Since 1964, the program has placed over 450 mid-career persons in one-year internships in public and private agencies involved in educational policy matters. Carefully recruited sponsors, who pay the Fellow's salary, serve as on-the-job mentors by demonstrating, through their daily tasks, how educational policy is shaped at the urban, state, or national level. In addition, through weekly meetings, Fellows have the opportunity to interact with authorities in education. National meetings of Fellows with other special groups contribute further to their understanding of educational policymaking. Costs of recruitment, placement and programs are borne by the EPF Program.

Educational Staff Seminar (ESS)
Telephone: 676-5948
Educational Staff Seminar (ESS) is a professional development program designed for staff members employed by the Executive and Legislative Branches of the federal government in the field of education. It is designed to expose these federal education policymakers to existing programs worth noting around the nation, as well as to innovations, research and emerging ideas in the field. This is accomplished through luncheon and dinner meetings, seminars, and national and international field trips.

Established in 1969, ESS is funded by the Institute and by partial reimbursement from the government agencies served. In fiscal year 1977 ESS conducted 60 programs for over 1800 federal employees.

The Associates Program (TAP)
Telephone: 676-5935
The Associates Program (TAP) is an evolving IEL activity. Its emphasis up to now has been to provide seminars for legislators and other policymakers at state capitals. Begun in 1972 with three state educational seminars TAP now sponsors 32 seminars, all directed by Associates who, on a part-time basis, arrange 5 to 10 programs annually.

TAP maintains a network of state-level "generalists" (Associates) whose ties to IEL in the nation's capital provide rare linkages among federal and state education policysetters. TAP encourages similar linkages among agencies and coalitions seeking to improve processes in state-level decisionmaking. It also sponsors national and regional conferences dealing with state-level responsibilities in education.

"Options in Education"
Telephone: 785-6462
IEL and National Public Radio coproduce the "Options in Education" series heard weekly over most of NPR's 201 member stations from coast to coast. Voice of America rebroadcasts the one-hour programs, and IEL makes cassettes and transcripts available at minimum costs. "Options" has received awards from the Association of State Education Department Information Officers (1978), The Education Writers Association (1974, '75 and '76) and from the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (1974). Funds for "Options in Education" are provided by IEL, National Institute of Education, Carnegie Corporation, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and other grantors.

Washington Policy Seminar (WPS)
Telephone: 676-5940
The Washington Policy Seminar (WPS) brings select groups of educators and policymakers to the Capital for three to five days of intensive exposure to the people, processes, and institutions which shape federal education policy. Speakers for the Seminar include Members of Congress, Congressional staff, senior officials of the Executive Branch, leaders of educational lobbies and associations, journalists and seasoned "Washington watchers." Funding for the Seminar is provided by IEL general support funds and reimbursement by sponsoring organizations.

Family Impact Seminar (FIS)
Telephone: 296-5330
The Family Impact Seminar seeks to identify and assess the effect on families and children of a variety of public policies. The Seminar and its several task forces are composed of scholars and policymakers. Together, they examine and test the feasibility of developing "family impact statements" on selected government policies and programs. The specific issues to be examined are selected from a broad range of existing or proposed public policies. The policies may include some in such areas as education, health or welfare, which are specifically designed to help families and children. Other areas such as taxation, which are focused primarily on other objectives, but nevertheless affect families and children, also are examined. Funding for the Seminar is provided by the Foundation for Child Development, the Lilly Endowment, Robert Sterling Clark, Mary Reynolds Babcock, Edna McConnell Clark Foundations and the Lydia DuPont Fund.

Ford Fellows in Educational Journalism (FFEJ)
Telephone: 676-5900
The Ford Fellows in Educational Journalism is an intensive, short-term professional development program for educational reporters and journalists. This pioneering effort offers Fellows a "sabbatical" from the fast-paced immediacy of daily educational reporting and allows them to pursue a full-time, three-month course of independent study in their designated educational interest areas. The program, which is supported jointly by The Ford Foundation, participating news organizations, and the Institute for Educational Leadership, reflects the conviction that better informed media will be a direct and positive influence for better education.

Education of the Handicapped Policy Project (EHPP)
Telephone: 676-5910
EHPP is building a national network of informed individuals and organizations that deal with issues arising from implementation of "The Education for All Handicapped Children Act" (Public Law 94-142). Legislators, policymakers and educators participate in seminars, meetings, forums and workshops that are common to many IEL activities. However, the special contact and expertise of other Institute Programs—TAP, ESS, EPFP, WPS and FFEJ—form the collaborative means by which the Project is accomplished. The Project also supports two national competitions for Policy Fellows (1) who show promise as future leaders in handicapped education, and (2) who are involved in the newspaper media. Project activities are conducted in cooperation with the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped which is also the funding agency.